

REMARKS

112 Rejections

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to remove the said body.

Applicants have amended Claim 16 to remove "e.g."

102 Rejections

Claims 1- 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Metz et al. (US 5,754,539). Applicants respectfully contend that the present invention as claimed in Claims 1-19 is neither shown nor suggested by the Metz et al. reference.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Metz et al. reference does not teach a multi-configuration network connection point device as set forth in newly amended independent Claim 1. Specifically independent claim 1 recites:

a first connection interface including a primary connection port... said first connection interface coupled to a first surface of said multi-configuration network connection point device;

a second connection interface including a secondary connection port for communicatively coupling via a wireless technology, wherein said second connection interface is secured in a fixed location said second

connection interface coupled to a second surface of said multi-configuration network connection point device;

Applicants respectfully assert that the Metz et al. reference does not teach a multi-configuration network connection point device. To the extent the Metz. et al. invention may mention a unit 8 for performing switching functions [Col. 3, lines 1 -3], Applicants respectfully asserts that the Metz et al. reference does not teach a multi-configuration connection point device as claimed in independent claim 1.

The present Office Action alleges figures 1 and 3 show a multi-configuration connection point device. To the extent the Metz et al. reference may mention Figure 1 is a ATM Local Area Network [Col. 2 lines 55 to 59] and Figure 3 shows a work station expanded by a unit for performing switching operations [Col. 2 line 65 to Col. 3 line 4], Applicant respectfully asserts the Metz et al. reference does not teach a multi-configuration connection point device as recited in Claim 1. The present Office Action alleges the mere mention of a physical layer 17 in Metz et al. reference teaches a primary connection port. Applicants respectfully assert the mere mention of a physical layer 17 in Metz et al. reference does not teach a first connection interface including a primary connection port for communicatively coupling to an upstream network device, the first connection interface coupled to a first surface of the multi-configuration network connection point device. The present Office Action alleges the interface is coupled to a body 2 of the Metz et al. reference. Applicants respectfully assert that the reference number 2 does not indicate a device body as reference number 2 appears to refer to several separate devices includes a simple telephone 4, a facsimile unit 6 and a DECT telephone 7 are shown within reference number 2.

The present Office Action alleges the Metz et al. reference shows a second connection interface including a secondary connection port 71 adapted to be secured in a fixed location. To the extent the Metz et al. reference may merely mention a base station 71, Applicant respectfully asserts that Metz et al. reference does not teach a second connection interface including a secondary connection port for communicatively coupling to a downstream network device via a wireless technology, wherein the second connection interface is secured in a fixed location and the second connection interface is coupled to a second surface of the multi-configuration network connection point device. Even if base station 71 is interpreted to be a wireless communication interface, Applicants respectfully assert that the Metz et al. reference does not provide any indication that the base station 71 is coupled to a second surface of the multi-configuration network connection point device. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert the Metz et al. reference does not mention anything regarding the base station 71 being secured in a fixed location.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Metz et al. reference teaches away from the present claimed multi-configuration network connection point device by indicating the components are separate devices with single configuration connections. To the extent the Metz reference shows a unit 8 for performing switching operations and a physically layer 17, Applicant respectfully asserts the Metz et al. reference shows physical layer 17 is not included in Unit 8 [Figure 2].

The present Office action also alleges the Metz et al reference shows a communication bus 9 for communicatively coupling the first connection interface 17 to the second connection interface 71. To the extent the Metz et al. reference may mention

a coupling array 9 is connected to the ATM layer 16 through a type 13 ATM adaptation layer [Col. 3 lines 47 –49], Applicants respectfully assert the Metz et al. reference does not teach a communication bus for communicatively coupling the first connection interface to the second connection interface.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 2 through 6 depend from allowable independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim.

With regard to claim 2, to the extent the Metz et al. reference may show separate interface circuits 41, 61 and 51, Applicants respectfully assert a multi-configuration network connection point device wherein the first connection interface comprises a single primary interface connection port for coupling with a singular communication path to an upstream device and the secondary connection interface comprises a plurality of interface connection ports.

With respect to Claim 3, Applicants Applicant respectfully asserts the Metz et al. reference does not teach dedicated interface ports for forwarding power.

With respect to Claim 3, Applicants Applicant respectfully asserts the Metz et al. reference does not teach a fault detection means for processing and interpreting data in fault detection and isolation operations.

With respect to Claim 5, the present Office Action alleges the Metz et al. reference teaches the secondary connection interface is configured for convenient placement in

fixed location in a manner that facilitates maintenance of system integrity and security. To the extent the Metz et al. reference may merely mention an ATM LAN and types of communications that can be used in an office [Col. 4, lines 9-22], Applicants respectfully assert the Metz et al. reference does not teach a secondary connection interface is configured for convenient placement in fixed locations in a manner that facilitates maintenance of system integrity and security.

With respect to Claim 3, Applicants Applicant respectfully asserts the Metz et al. reference does not teach an anchoring means for fastening the multi-configuration network connection point device to a stationary member so that portions of the behind the anchoring means towards the primary connection port are recessed in a cavity of the stationary member.

Regarding Claim 7, the present Office Action refers to the same components of the Metz et al. reference and allege they teach the present claimed invention. In accordance with rationale similar to the above, Applicants respectfully assert the Metz et al. reference does not teach the present invention as claimed in Claim 7. Applicants respectfully assert the Metz et al. reference does not mention a fixed location 8 as alleged in the present Office Action. To the extent the Metz reference may mention a first control circuit 12 used to control coupling array 9, Applicants respectfully assert that the Metz et al. reference does not teach a means for intelligently concentrating data from a plurality of interface connection ports included in the second connection interface for communication on the primary connection port of the first connection interface.

Applicant respectfully asserts dependent Claims 8 – 14 are allowable as depending from allowable independent claim 7. To the extent the present Office Action rejects claims 8 through 11 for the same reasons as claims 2 through 6, Applicants respectfully assert Claims 8 through 14 are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

The present Office Action rejects claims 15 though 19 for the same reasons as claims 3 through 5. Applicants respectfully assert Claims 15 through 19 are allowable for reasons similar to the above rational.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in the present claims is neither shown, suggested or taught by the Metz et al. reference.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 10/28, 2004



John F. Ryan
Reg. No. 47, 050
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060